EDUCATION[1]

Why do children of Hawaiian ancestry experience so much difficulty in the public schools?

Although the problems can be simply stated, solutions satisfactory to all involved (parents, teachers, children, etc.) have yet to emerge. Indeed, our previous efforts, despite good intentions, have generally had a mixed reception.

To begin with, we have no illusions about our capacity to offer a prescription for success; we have little practical advice to offer. Only those who are willing to "get dust in their eyes," in the words of one observer, can change the system. To be sure the experimentation, innovation, and hard work which is required can be facilitated by research, consultants, university coursework, and orientation programs. But it is folly to believe that one can learn how to teach children in Nanakuli and Waianae through abstract discussion. While we can suggest that members of a culturally Hawaiian community may (an already qualified generalization) respond to social influence cues in a manner different from others, what that implies for a teacher confronted at 9:15 A. M., September 21, with 35 inattentive fourth graders is another question. It is a practical question best solved by the expertise of a professional educator, an individual trained in the art of teaching, influencing, persuading, and controlling youngsters, irrespective of cultural background.

A Concept of Culture

We believe that a majority of the children at the Nanakuli schools are members of a distinct cultural group which for convenience can be called Hawaiian. However, we wish to make clear that we are not using the term Hawaiian to imply a racial group but rather a culture. Race is by and large a clumsy term, since it is generally applied for social and cultural and not for biological reasons.

Briefly, we mean by culture the ways of thinking, feeling, and acting shared by a group of people. The term culture is enormously flexible, but nevertheless useful. To illustrate, the State-of-Hawaii culture has characteristics which distinguish it sharply from mainland culture, partly because it is a combination of highly diverse elements, e.g., Hawaiian, Anglo-Saxon, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Samoan, etc.

However, within this larger culture, which we have called the State-of-Hawaii culture, there are ethnic groups which also have distinct

---

[1] Contributed by Ronald Gallimore (University of Hawaii), Stephen Boggs (University of Hawaii), and W. Scott MacDonald (Hawaii State Department of Education), this study is based on data collected at Nanakuli School from 1965 to 1968. It involves numerous samples, including entire classes.

cultures. Each of these groups have qualities which are unique and which distinguish them from the rest.

Of course, the entire State, with all its ethnic minorities, is part of the general American culture (or society if you wish), which is reflected in the mass media, etc. Where one finds commonalties among people it is convenient to employ the term culture, even though in other areas of life they may differ. While one removes shoes before entering the house, eats raw fish, and enjoys many aspects of life in Hawaii, his rearing of children, for example, may differ strikingly from his neighbors. Thus, whether we are part of the State-of-Hawaii culture, the mainland culture, the psychologist or the teacher culture (they exist, have their own rules; manner of speaking, thinking, and acting just like any culture), depends upon what part of your life you wish to examine. To sit under the hau tree, drink beer, and talk story; to attend a teacher's convention and discuss intellectual matters over cocktails; or to sit at home and watch television are all things one can enjoy and are all generated by membership in several cultures. Some people are fortunate enough and travelled enough to feel at home in many cultures. What we are suggesting is very simple: the more one becomes accustomed to and comfortable in different cultures, the less useful the term culture becomes in describing his behavior. But for most people, one way of life remains the only way.

The incredible diversity of Hawaii makes it useful to distinguish between public and private culture. While the Japanese population of Hawaii retains a life style (we use this in the same way we use culture) that reflects many features of the culture of Japan, they have also acquired the capacity to behave successfully within the public culture of American life and have contributed significantly to the public culture, as have other groups. It is also true that the diverse ethnic groups of Hawaii vary in the extent to which they have entered the public culture, e.g., learned mass-media English, accepted Dr. Spock, etc. Behaving competently in the public culture does not require a total rejection of one's heritage, although it appears that the extreme mobility of American life and the impact of the mass media make biculturalism (i.e., operating in the public culture while retaining a private culture) more difficult if the private culture is particularly distinctive.

In suggesting that it is possible to be bicultural, i.e., to maintain one's private culture and at the same time to operate in the public culture when one must conduct business, apply for jobs, comply with explicit and implicit rules of society, etc., we have been assuming that the private culture neither conflicts with nor hinders participation in the public culture. Of course, to some extent all private cultures interfere with the public culture in some way, e.g., the mainlander may not know it is part of the public culture of the State of Hawaii to remove shoes before entering a home. Of course, it is tempting and perhaps comforting to believe that the culture reflected by the school which a child attends is the right, best, ideal, righteous culture. To

be sure, for economic and social reasons it is important to master the culture which the school represents. However, to take the next step, as is often done, and suggest that a child is deprived if he enters school unprepared for the demands of the system is the grossest form of social snobbery. Indeed, those who are first to criticize the ways of others are those who are least prepared to operate in any community except their own. We wish to make it exceedingly clear that Hawaiian children are at a disadvantage in the kinds of school they usually attend; the fact that they do experience much difficulty is evidence that they are at a disadvantage. But why are they at a disadvantage? Because their language, their ways of relating to people and institutions, and the things they hold dear are different from what is necessary for success in the public schools. It is easy at this point to fall into the trap of believing that the child should be changed, and this has been tried with little success. The alternative is to change the school.

Does this mean that the schools and the teachers must change their goals and standards? In the first place, there is not that much agreement among teachers and schools as to what the goals and standards of public education should be. Second, the parents of Nanakuli have the right to be heard on this matter since it is their community and their children which the school serves. Thus, rather than attempt to answer this question now, we suggest that while the school is going through a period of critical examination, the issue of standards and goals be discussed. In the next few years the problem of what the school in Nanakuli is supposed to be doing for the children ought to be continually asked.

Education and Culture

At one time nearly every culture left the task of education to the family. Now, for many reasons we have turned to professional teachers for the task. The school is usually an institutionalization of child rearing, and in most communities reflects the families it serves, i.e., it has the same values, aspirations, and training techniques. The teachers and the children generally share many cultural characteristics which ensure that they will understand each other. Where this is true the teacher can comfortably and successfully function as a transmitter of knowledge and skill as well as a reinforcing agent for what is taught in the homes. If the school culture does not differ from the home culture, the child is usually able to make the transition from one to the other with little distress or difficulty.

However, there are some cultures whose children do not find school so easily entered. There are some general reasons for this, but each is really a special case. What is surely not true is the inferiority or deficiency explanation which has always been popular and and which is now presented in the guise of such terms as "culturally deprived," and "culturally deficient." By definition every one belongs to some culture, although, to be sure, being well trained in one culture

may be of little use in another.

Education and Cultural Change

The public schools serve also to change the culture which supports them. For example, over the last century significant changes in health attitudes and practices have been introduced into our way of life by the schools. Gradual changes of similar magnitude include the increasing emphasis on higher education, science training, etc. Such changes are of course regarded by most citizens as highly desirable and consistent with their general aspirations, despite the fact they represent a change. In recent years, for a variety of reasons, the change function of the schools has become increasingly important and controversial. Sometimes the changes are not well received by the community, for example, the reaction (illustrated by the Scopes Monkey Trial) to the introduction of scientific accounts of the origin of man into the public school curricula.

If they have their own culture, do Hawaiian children need to learn what the schools can teach? Of course they do. It is an economic necessity and becoming increasingly so as the number of unskilled, industrial jobs diminish and as rural areas become incapable of supporting life. But this is not the issue as we see it. It is: how can this be accomplished, given the history of failure which the schools have endured?

Before we begin to look at some ideas on how the schools can be more successful, it is well to remember that the decision to come to grips with teaching Hawaiian children is a commitment not always acceptable to teachers. In brief, teachers become agents of social change, not merely transmitters and stimulators. This will inevitably lead to conflict with the community and with the parents many of whom, while wanting their children to be educated, do not want them to change their style of life. Many students who go to college learn they cannot go home again in the poetic sense--once their eyes are opened to new ideas and new ways, the old way loses its hold. And so it will be for the Hawaiian community, although, as we have noted earlier, it is possible to adapt one's style to the situation, e.g., be bicultural.

Do Hawaiian parents want their children to be educated? On this point there should be no confusion; the overwhelming majority place education high on their list of aspirations. The problem for them is simple--since many members of the community have had minimal education, they do not know how to implement their aspirations. In some cases there are conflicting values between the "home culture" and the "school culture," e.g., when parents assign greater importance to family over school responsibilities. Still it is clear that the parents turn to the school with the hope and expectation that their children will be educated. We believe it is the responsibility of the public school to develop an educational "system" which will promote academic accomplishment among Hawaiian children. It will not be easy, and it will likely require that many assumptions about the way children learn will

have to be junked, at least in Nanakuli.

Implicit in this argument is the notion that the school must change in order to effect changes in the students. Many people feel strongly that it is the family's responsibility to prepare students for the school system. We believe that the system must prepare itself to serve the community for which it operates.

To summarize, we believe we have in Nanakuli a complex conflict between the public culture of the schools and the private culture of the students. There are large numbers of children being raised to live what we can call a Hawaiian style of life; they are not deprived since their culture is in many ways richer than that found in the suburban sprawl of the mainland. They are not raised to participate in what we have called the public culture which the schools seek to transmit. Hawaiian parents raise their children to meet the requirements of life as they see them, not as seen by the school or the larger culture. And the American value system says very clearly that they have a right to do so. It is true of course that they unknowingly pay a penalty for insisting upon exercising this right--the schools are not equipped to teach communication and computation skills to children who do not fit a certain mode; but schools can change.

It is highly misleading to assume that the children of Nanakuli are culturally deprived or are deficient in any absolute sense. It is true, however, that certain skills, which public culture demands and which the current school arrangement requires, are not part of the private culture, which Hawaiian parents teach their children. What is not true is the common assumption that Hawaiian parents teach their children nothing. Indeed 175 years after the haole invasion the Hawaiian culture still has much of value from which many of us could benefit.

The Language Question

Mainlanders coming to the Islands frequently experience at least a mild case of "culture shock" when they discover that the style of life here differs in some important ways from what they knew in their home town. This experience can be more intense if they happen to be a teacher assigned to a rural area which is populated by people of Hawaiian ancestry. To begin with, the language spoken is different--unique both in word meaning and emotional overtones.

Initially there were two competing languages in the Hawaiian Islands: English and Hawaiian, with the former introduced by missionaries, businessmen, sailors, and adventurers. Later, as the Oriental immigration was begun, a common language became necessary and functional; as in other colonial areas with diverse language groups (e.g., New Guinea), the resulting language was an amalgamation of all languages involved. In Hawaii as in New Guinea this "new language" was called pidgin. True pidgin is rarely heard today, although what is really a dialect of English is popularly referred to as pidgin.

Because of the similarity to English, the Island Dialect is often interpreted as an inferior language. If one judges the merits of a communication system of orally produced sounds by its functional value, then Island Dialect (inappropriately called pidgin) is as functional as the hyper-abstract language of a chemist. Mainstream English is dysfunctional for anyone wishing to communicate in Nanakuli, and to use in his association with local people. The immediate reaction for many is, "Does that mean we should accept pidgin [sic] and use it in the classroom?" And the obvious answer, "NO!" When French is taught in high school, is it required that one "unlearn" English? No. When one goes to India to live and learn the language, is it necessary to unlearn English? No. If these points are true then why is it necessary for a child in Nanakuli to unlearn Island Dialect in order to learn English? It is not. The confusion over the language issue seems to be rooted in the notion that "pidgin" is simply a deficient version of English--that is, if one speaks Dialect and cannot speak English then he must stop speaking Dialect in order to start speaking English. Of course, this is an improbable goal if all the relevant social relationships outside of school are conducted in Dialect. By insisting that a child unlearn Dialect and learn English, instead of simply learning English, one is in effect telling him to stop talking to his mother and father. If you ask mothers and fathers in Nanakuli what they rank as number one in the academic hierarchy, many will say language, proper English, and so forth. But, while they want their children to learn this "new" language they do not want to be cut off from their children by a school-imposed barrier. They want the child to be bilingual--to speak Dialect when appropriate, and English when appropriate. Is that possible? Of course. Ask anyone who has lived in Hawaii and learned the local Dialect if their English has deteriorated. Or ask a local who speaks perfect English what the value of Island Dialect is. There are many Island people, with ample evidence of academic distinction, who can when necessary or appropriate, wax eloquent in Island Dialect.

There is little doubt that the prevalence and persistence of the Dialect makes the teacher's job more difficult. Anyone who has tried to teach non-English speaking students in English knows that an entirely different set of problems is superimposed on the usual school problems. That is the point. One cannot come to most Island schools and teach as if the children ought to know adequate English. It is obvious that they do not speak it as comfortably or confidently as they do Dialect. That they cannot express feeling in English or their conceptions of the world as freely in English is also obvious.

There are two questions relevant to ask at this point: First, should they learn English in addition to knowing Dialect? Of course they should. If one does not know English, he is at a disadvantage. Jobs, social mobility, reading skill, and the complexities of modern life in the United States all require a command of the common language.

The second question: How do we proceed? First of all, we admit that we have not been doing a good job with Dialect-speaking children.

That is not difficult to do, and a somewhat obvious point, given the generally recognized low levels of accomplishment of the children. A new style of teaching that works must be developed. For us the relevant question is: What works?

Motivation and Social Influence Processes in the Classroom

Recently the Department of Education has become sensitive to the notion that among the various ethnic groups in Hawaii, children are trained to behave differently. For those whose early experiences lead to skills that are not valued by the school, these differences may become a problem. In particular, how parents, in this case Hawaiians, train their children to behave, the kinds of techniques they use, and the rules they enforce are all relevant to how the child will respond to the teacher. As we have already suggested, the cultural differences between the school and the community in Nanakuli are great enough to make it necessary for teachers to learn, in effect, a new psychology.

It is convenient to think of the ways children are trained in terms of social influence mechanisms--of all the psychological weapons at the teacher's disposal these are the most central. By giving and withdrawing rewards (both material and nonmaterial) and punishments (physical and nonphysical) the teacher shapes and controls the behavior of his students. Praise, a spanking, a scolding, a smile, a frown, a gold star are all techniques one may use to "socially influence" children. Clearly, the experience of working with children and a degree of personal flexibility are involved. But aside from the fact that individual teachers vary in terms of the techniques they use, there is considerable evidence that there are cultural differences among children as well. It is also obvious that children, as individuals, differ with respect to what social influence mechanisms affect them. The way a child is reared is perhaps the best way of explaining why he responds in a certain manner. In other words, one can speak of the signals a parent teaches his child to attend and orient to, and the kinds of responses that are appropriate to different configurations of signals. For us the question is whether the signals which Hawaiian children learn in their homes differ in any important ways from those which teachers expect when they confront their classes. Our research suggests they do.

Hawaiian children are often accused of having a short attention span. Analysis of this notion points to the following: attention span appears to refer to the strength of the habit of attending to social influence signals. Is it true that Hawaiian children lack such habits? No. What our brief analysis of their home experience suggests is a mismatch of signals. For example, while it is expected that mild rebuke or withdrawal of approval--even frowning at a child--will elicit the attending habit, it appears more likely to elicit passivity or withdrawal from an Hawaiian child. We have tested this notion two ways:

by a controlled experiment and by classroom observation. In both cases we can find no evidence that criticism will increase academically-related behavior. It may temporarily decrease disruptive behavior, but in most instances the misbehavior will be resumed very quickly.

To begin, we need to clear up a few ideas about children in general and especially the question of dependence and independence.

One of the most confused concepts has to do with notions about dependency. While it is popularly regarded as appropriate to toddlers, it becomes a source of displeasure if the toddler forms of dependency continue. This generally leads people to say that as the child becomes mature, he should become less dependent and more independent. That is not true. In fact, dependence and independence are not as closely related as most people think. What is correct, of course, is that certain kinds of behavior, which we may wish to label dependency, become inappropriate with increasing age. The clinging vine at two would be more accurately described as "deviant" if that behavior persisted to age ten. But it must be understood that the child who shows an interest at six in winning his teacher's approval is also behaving dependently. What has happened, of course, is that the kinds of rewards or reactions which he seeks from adults have kept pace with his age. Dependency is thus better thought of as synonymous with susceptibility to social-influence cues of certain varieties. Thus the child, who is said to be highly independent and achievement motivated because he works so hard to do his school work, is also working hard to win the explicit and implicit approval of adults. To that extent he is dependent. Indeed it can be argued that the typical classroom, kindergarten, and especially the first grade room is arranged on the assumption that the children are highly dependent on the teacher. If this influence mechanism is removed, the teacher must find new ways of doing things. What if a child has been trained to be independent, to rely more on peers than on the parent or teacher, and to seek only minimal instruction from adults?

One very clear implication of these ideas is the inappropriateness for Nanakuli children of the typical classroom arrangement: one adult in the front of the room with twenty-five to forty youngsters attending and orienting to his influence attempts. If one watches a kindergarten or first grade room for any length of time, it is clear that a large proportion of time is devoted to strengthening this habit: a group of individuals, each of whom focuses on a single adult authority for directions, correction, and guidance. However, such a system assumes that children are accustomed to being dependent upon adults for such things, and that children have relatively weaker tendencies to attend to peers. Neither of these assumptions can be said to be entirely true of the children in Nanakuli. But it does not follow that they have a poor attention span. What does follow is the notion that it may take a different set of social conditions in the classroom to elicit the kind of attending habits which facilitate learning.

Observations in the Elementary School Classrooms

In the first place, children in the elementary school prefer to initiate their own activity and to complete self-initiated tasks before starting other ones. This is true of a wide variety of tasks, including class-work:

> The class had just begun work on a written arithmetic assignment. The teacher selected the first group of children to go to the blackboard to work some problems while the rest of the class worked on the assignment at their seats. Frank was supposed to be in the first group to go to the board. However, he said, 'Miss D. I no like go to the board.' He had already busily begun the written assignment and evidently wanted to continue it to completion without interruption. Miss D. allowed him to remain at his seat continuing the assignment. . . . When the last group was called to the board Frank went with them, for he had just finished the last problem on the assignment.

The tasks which children most readily initiate on their own are the "housekeeping" and handicraft types of tasks. In fact, they will vie with one another at any time to do housekeeping tasks, and disputes break out. Jigsaw puzzles, educational card games, flash cards, coloring, and reading are other examples of frequently initiated activities.

Generally, children do not like to pay attention, as a group, to instructions given by the teacher, and they almost never listen closely to instructions the first several times they are given. Nevertheless, teachers spend a great deal of time trying to get the children's attention in order to switch them from one activity to another. Teachers have a number of rituals which they employ for this purpose--such as, switching the lights off until all are quiet and ready to begin another activity, playing "Simon says" with such words as "Put books away," "Be quiet," or suggesting, "Let's see if you can hear the pin drop," and many others. Sometimes children enjoy these games and they are often bored by harangues which are intended to accomplish the same purpose. Either way, when the new activity is supposed to begin, the majority have little conception of what is to be done.

Most of the time children are much more strongly oriented toward other children than they are toward adults. They help one another very readily, copy one another's work, and are very sensitive to being outdone by others. Games involving competition in spelling or recognizing words were popular in one class. For example:

> Three boys had obtained mimeographed sheets of paper containing arithmetic problems and were racing each other

to finish. One of the boys beat the other two. One gave up, and the other was too slow. The winner then got a new sheet (the same problems) and started another race with a fourth boy. The latter moved away and while he was gone the first boy began copying answers from his first paper instead of doing the problems again. When he had finished he took the paper to show the fourth boy, who had in the meantime lost interest.

A frequent result of the lack of attention to the teacher's instructions and positive orientation toward other children is that children attempt to do the assignment by copying. More rarely, they may ask questions of other classmates.

Helping one another does not mean sharing possessions, like pencils. There are frequently bitter arguments about this, and a child will rarely yield a pencil to another, even when commanded to do so. In general, children frequently are very "touchy" toward one another, and brief but bitter fights are not uncommon. Whether helping or fighting, however, children most often act as if adults were not present, and other children were the primary source of all gratification and frustration.

The typical classroom works against the powerful peer-affiliation motive which appears to operate in Hawaiian social groups. To diminish the strength of this motive may be futile, at least if one employs a head-on attack--that is, by punitive means in the early grades. Second, and related, the punitive measures used in the attempt to eliminate attending to peers and to encourage attending to the teacher have the effect of increasing passivity, withdrawal, and avoidance. Hawaiian parents train their children to respond to negative sanctions with respect and obedience, and not with active attempts to alter the parents' response. If an Hawaiian parent scolds his child, the child is likely to go to the bedroom, or outside, and remain there until the incident becomes history. Children of certain other cultural groups are more likely to follow a scolding with an active attempt to obtain parental approval, and, in general, to seek praise and verbal approval.

Among Hawaiian youngsters, however, many of the social-influence techniques which are verbal in nature are ineffective since children seem largely indifferent and inattentive to adult talk, unless it is deliberately entertaining, or directed at them individually. They do not know what to make of verbal praise; it is at best meaningless to them. Protestations of affection, or the withdrawal of affection, are not understood. A teacher's threat of becoming angry is likely to be ignored unless it means that he will very soon use physical punishment--that is what an adult's anger means to a child, not the withdrawal of affection.

They respond warmly to being touched and held, arm around shoulders, or spoken to eye to eye. They also respond to a firm, individually directed scolding, especially if accompanied by a gruff but affectionate gesture. They are sensitive at times to adult approval and

anger. When seeking to make recompense to an adult, the most typical act is to engage in some helpful chore. Unless the adult appreciates the intent of this, the child is likely to feel rebuffed.

Other important determinants of attention and interest are the extent to which task performance will be subsequently evaluated and the probability of objective failure and/or social disapproval. The importance of these two factors is well illustrated by the following excerpts from the notes of two observers:

When attempting any task in which failure, or disapproval, are objectively likely, children manifest great fear of failure.

> On many occasions the teacher has been approached for approval of a portion of an assignment. With her affirmative appraisal the children have returned to their seats to complete the assignment.

> The children are doing addition and subtraction with the numerals which total 5 when added. The teacher had showed them how to do the assignment by using the fingers on one hand. Richard comes to me again and again asking me how to do each problem. I put him through the steps holding up the number of fingers corresponding to the first numeral printed on the assignment sheet, taking away or adding the number of fingers corresponding to the second numeral printed, and asking how many fingers are left--the answer. He starts doing the first step himself, and each time he comes back he does more of the procedure on his own without my telling him or showing him. Finally, he does the whole problem correctly from start to finish without any prompting from me, but still will not write down the answer he has reached until I confirm it.

> One girl had sought help from me in writing a new letter (they had just begun script). She was having a great deal of difficulty with the letter. After showing her and guiding her hand in writing the letter I moved away to help someone else. A little later when passing near her she hailed me saying, 'Betty, I still don't know how.'

> Steven worked diligently on the arithmetic assignment. He asks me to check one of the answers. It was incorrect, so I circled it (as the class had been instructed to do). He began erasing the circle and putting down the correct answer instead. I said, 'But you are supposed to circle it incorrect.' No response from him. Later during the practice spelling test, Steven was again sitting at my table. The first word was 'children.' He looked at me and said he couldn't write it. I whispered to him to try. He began the first part of the word,

showed it to me and asked if it was correct. I said that I couldn't tell him but to go ahead. After the 7th word (most of his words were incorrect) he stopped attempting them. A little later he closed his writing tablet and just sat there propping his head up with his hand. As the class began correcting the words he tore the sheet out of the tablet, crumpled it up and threw it into the wastebasket. This sequence of events illustrates a number of things. The initial positive mood remained until time to correct the arithmetic problems. Not only were many of his answers incorrect but he also received a cue from me indicating a lack of approval and the lowering of the probability of subsequently receiving affirmative behavior from me. On the spelling exam his inability was again pointed up and the subjective probability of approval or help from me was lowered even more. Finally, withdrawal from the task took place. The fear of failure and fear of further disapproval from me were too great.

The possibility of experiencing rejection is high in the laugh game. In this, one child is to remain stoic while another attempts to make him laugh. While a few children are eager to become involved, many others tried to avoid participating and seemed very embarrassed when they were involved. The possibility of a rebuff is very high in this game.

Some Implications for Teaching in the Elementary School

We turn now to some positive advantages of the behavior and feelings which we have been describing. The self-initiation of activity, for example, does not typically produce dependence upon the teacher--despite the impression given in the section above. In most cases Hawaiian children will not ask for help or assistance from any adult, unless previous experience has taught them that a particular kind of assistance will regularly be provided. For example, children will cluster around the teacher's desk as she grades their arithmetic papers, if she allows them to do this, and they will continue to do this even when they are shooed away on occasion. It seems possible that some of the most valuable instruction could take place in situations initiated by the child when he is most receptive.

Children may be reluctant to believe that assistance will be forthcoming, or they may not know how far to go. Some of the examples above nicely illustrate this--they constitute testing of the limits of the adult's willingness to help. Thus children have been noted to seek attention on the pretext of needing help with a word and then have a hard time deciding what word to ask about. This is a way of checking the probability of receiving help--of making sure that the adult's response to the child would still be helpful.

The more assistance they get, the longer they will try, and the more help they will ask for. Examples of this are:

Barbara was reading a story to me and asked about the word 'Harry.' A little later she came to the 'Harry's" and asked me what it was. I said, 'You know what that is. I just told you.' She said, 'Harry' but then sat looking at it and did not continue. Finally she said, 'Aw, come on, Betty, I can't.' She evidently had trouble with the possessive form of the word.

One girl was drawing a tree and kept insisting on my assistance, although I refused for some time. She may have been testing the probability of receiving help from me, to see how far I would go in meeting her demands. Recently this same girl drew another picture of a tree with apples, and the apples were exact replicas of the ones I had finally drawn for her many months earlier.

Obviously there are risks in providing help and assistance to children who are not used to seeking it. If overdone, the child may become generally disinhibited and overexcited. This, in fact, frequently happens. Also, help given inconsistently is probably worse than none at all, because it confirms the child's frequent conviction that adults are best left alone. Modest assistance, regularly provided when requested, is the most useful to the child, as well as being effective.

How can a teacher regularly and reliably provide individual help to a large number of children? By taking advantage of some of the behavior which has been described, particularly the children's orientation to one another.

I drew a bow for one of the girls making a Christmas wreath, and later six to ten children came to ask for the same help.

Another example began with a new letter to be learned in script and one or two individuals asked to have either the teacher or myself draw a sample on their paper for them to follow, thus making it easier to learn. Subsequently numerous children sought and received such assistance.

Two of the children had the teacher correct their arithmetic assignments and then used their papers to correct other papers as they were finished.

In this process the first step occurs when one child seeks help and receives affirmative assistance and reassurance. This will be observed by other children and will increase their expectation of receiving assistance. The second step occurs when they seek similar assistance. The assistance provided may often be a new task, information, or a way of doing something.

What, it may be asked, are the other children doing in the meantime?

Here is precisely where the preference for self-initiated activities can be turned to the teacher's advantage.

> One classroom had been so structured that the children were free to initiate their own activities along acceptable lines (play cards, work puzzles, color, finish another assignment, etc.) when they have completed an assignment.
>
> The children will work to complete a task so that a more enjoyable activity can be engaged in. A number of instances have been noted for one individual in particular who rushes at a fantastic speed to complete an assignment and begin some other activity.

Finally, it should be noted that it is the individualized assistance and the opportunity to model an adult which is significant to the child, as in the case of drawing a letter in script, cited above, and not a written symbol on a page handed out.

Eliciting Attention and Interest from Adolescents

Let us examine some of the factors which appear to elicit attention and interest among adolescents.

1. Obligation to the person making the request: If the students like the teacher making the request, they are far more likely to attend to and persist at assigned tasks. Teachers utilizing this teaching strategy will find it important to discover actions that will raise their own prestige in the eyes of the students. Making sure the student can handle the task, distributing work equitably (in the eyes of student), and checking work and giving a fair appraisal of it (often done subtly through expression, indirect action, or through intermediaries) are some ways of demonstrating to students that teachers care about the welfare of students, and this will result in the students' assigning power to group members to influence and direct their classroom behavior. One word of caution; it seems that among the Hawaiians (Is it not true elsewhere?) obligation is mutual. If students are obligated to work for a teacher, the teacher is obligated to enhance the welfare of the students in all those ways a teacher can--to anticipate students needs and desires, such as preparing special snacks; to arrange transportation for special occasions; to assist in tournaments; to participate in community activities; and so forth. (Parents do the same.) The problem is that this second half of the obligation (the teacher's part) takes time and effort.

2. Activities have different interest values: In general, the interest value of activities can be ordered as follows: play (sports, excursions), socialized activities (joint projects in which students are somewhat free to establish their own role, pace, etc.), participation activities (in which students are an active part of the ongoing activity, such as

competitions, quizzes), manual skills, some kinds of drills (math drill, in which students have access to answers and there is a single, correct answer), and, of much less interest, problem-solving (in which students are in jeopardy of having to give a wrong or foolish answer without knowing how to reduce the chances of failure). A part of this ordering of activity interest seems to be an avoidance of conceptual activity, though this does not mean that these students are inferior in conceptual ability since they demonstrate such ability in a variety of ways.

3. The social tone of the situation: This has a lot to do with the kind of attention given by students and the persistence they will show. If the situation is one of authoritarian control in which the teacher in charge does not permit student to student interaction, there will be a general trend for students to show compliance, but a low order of attention and relatively short persistence. The successful authoritarian can maintain a quiet class and a fair degree of work. This presumes liberal use of subtle social reward by the teacher. There are several problems with this style of teaching: (1) the pupils leave all responsibility for lesson evaluation and social control to the teacher, (2) the quality of attention is usually that of compliance without personal involvement, and (3) a need for self-expression seems to be generated in such classes, so that subsequent activities or other classes may be difficult to manage because students are "letting off steam."

4. A social situation in which there is no structure: This may lead to a high participation level, but could also lead to disorganization--some students will spontaneously develop games and some will begin teasing, and the level of activity will steadily rise along with the noise level. Some students may call for order, expecting the teacher to bring the class to more academically oriented activity. Normally they will not, themselves, directly contribute to this end unless they are trained to assume this responsibility--a task which also takes the teacher's time and energy.

When students are permitted easy communication, trust the teacher, know the goals of the class--especially if they have been asked to participate in their establishment--and when the teacher gives an ongoing evaluation of activity (thus showing interest in student activity, and a genuine willingness to render assistance), students will achieve an optimal level of interest and persistence. It has frequently been observed that some students will work for 90 minutes at a stretch on a math drill with ordinarily distracting conditions surrounding them: the radio blasting away, a few students eating lunch, a couple of better students assisting a few poorer students, and the teacher sitting beside and nodding approval at the efforts of another student.

Teaching Strategies

In this section an attempt has been made to offer some generalizations about some of the variations in teaching strategies we have

observed in the Leeward schools. In addition we have tried to evaluate their effectiveness with the dominant population of the area. Of course the portraits are over-simplified since teachers do not "fit" in any one category all the time--even the most consistent teacher at times employs aspects of another strategy to meet a particular situation. Our intent is not to categorize teachers but to stimulate discussion about what teachers actually do in the classroom and what kinds of reactions they elicit.

Type-1 Strategy: Not all teachers have difficulty getting the children to attend to directions. There are some teachers who appear to have mastered the same techniques employed by the parents--they are able to maintain an adult-centered classroom with a high degree of what is usually called "control." They are seen by the children as being similar to parents. In such classrooms, as in the family, children learn that the teachers are the authorities which make and enforce rules and define the tasks. In this kind of classroom the students look to the teacher for maintenance of control and do not assume responsibility for what goes on in or out of the classroom. What seems to happen is this: by retaining decision-making and access to resource distribution, this parent-like teacher maintains (just as parents do) a very strong influence, with the students tied to the teacher for practical reasons. For example, he may protect students from teasing and status maneuvering that may go on in unstructured settings; he may also dispense resources, e.g., extend recess, intervene in conflicts with parents and administrators, and offer access to school equipment at unauthorized times. It is not so much whether he is warm or cold, or employs harsh discipline, as it is whether he comprehends the subtleties in the authoritarian value system (which students have learned at home) and uses them to socially embarrass and thus control those who misbehave. It seems that the implicit or explicit threat of physical punishment may assist in this process because students can accept having to do something for fear of punishment; however, the physical threat is not essential to the process. Some of the most successful teachers are physically small, but maintain tight control by the force of their personalities.

Is this style of teaching a solution? In the first place, and no matter how one looks at it, not all teachers can be the hub of activity in the manner we have described. Second, it works less and less effectively with students who have difficulty in school and particularly as they enter the upper grades. Third, while it may convey the formal course content to the students it seems to limit learning in the following areas: (1) creative problem-solving, (2) abstract reasoning (because the students see their role as one of achieving concrete tasks set by the teacher), (3) social responsibility (because social judgment and control are reserved by the teacher). By keeping for himself the final judgment, the parent-like teacher tends to keep the students in a child's role rather than bring them to adulthood.

Type-2 Strategy: Strategy 2 is based on the attempt to win the favor and loyalty of the children by concessions to their demands. The teacher who employs this strategy has varying degrees of organization in the presentation of material, but usually has little if any social organization in the classroom--this condition is seen by the teacher and others involved as indicating a "lack of control." This teacher often makes contracts with students on an individual basis in order to interest them in activities and the learning process. Such contracts may also involve the class as a whole and the teacher may require that the students complete some academic goals in order to enjoy a reward or privilege, e.g., a day off, or an excursion. In this situation the relationship between the students' behavior and the distribution of rewards follows a vague process; often the original contract or agreement is altered by means of student pressure on the teacher and the teacher has difficulty regulating such contracts. The modal response to this type of classroom is one of seeming chaos in which students have freedom of movement in the classroom and open (if tacit) approval to communicate with peers about social as well as academic issues. In such cases the teacher may be regarded as anything from a clown to a pal, depending on his effectiveness. The teacher usually disregards the prescribed curriculum and presents material which is at least partly determined by the students. The students perceive this kind of approach in a variety of ways: some are upset because of the lack of structure and the apparent meaninglessness of classroom activities, although this does not mean these students are always "model" in their behavior. Other students, who fail to see the relevance of the classroom activity to their lives, enjoy the opportunity to get out from under the suppressive thumb of the authoritarian school situation and become rather spontaneous in their activities; behavior will range from quiet talking to bolting out of doors for various kinds of games, such as "chase-master." These students are accustomed to taking enjoyment when and where they can find it; often such students distinguish between this class and regular school classes where traditional material is covered. A few students will remain in the classroom, studying what they think is the "proper" material, and be unmoved by the opportunity to play with other students. And, of course, a few students will cut class to contact friends in other classrooms, even though they run the risk of being reported for appearing in an unauthorized place.

However, the "buddy" style teaching strategy cannot be easily dismissed as totally useless. The more effective teachers of this style of presentation can involve some students in work and at least a part of the class may produce original and creative academic work, which is so often absent in the class of a teacher who uses type-1 strategy. This seems to be because the students are not cast into the role of the "child." Rather, the teacher approaches the students as if they are adults, or at least approaching adulthood, and treats them with appropriate status recognition. This means that students have a voice in determining

activities, in establishing the pace of work, and often in developing a social organization unique to the classroom. If a student misbehaves, other students may either correct the student, or much more frequently, ask the teacher to intervene. In such cases the teacher may well ask the advice of students concerning what action should be taken in regard to the misbehavior, though the teacher is not expected to adopt the suggestions of students without revision.

While with the type-1 approach, the development of rapport is fairly simple (the first step is accepting or not accepting the teacher as an authority; in some cases there is a second step, involving a further definition of the authoritarian as "tough," "fair," etc.), the development of rapport in the type-2 strategy is more complex. The first stage is seen as altering the teacher from authority to not-authority. This may involve the dropping of "Mr." and addressing the teacher only by his last name. The next phase involves determining whether the teacher is worthy of attention. This is when he becomes either a clown, a "good guy," or an older sister or brother. This phase may be accompanied by designation of a "nickname," invitations to certain activities, borrowing of things, etc. The next phase involves the establishment of a degree of intimacy and, hence, mutual influence. It is at this phase that the ultimate effectiveness of the teacher is established. If the "buddy" teacher can establish a fairly intimate relationship with students, the students will enter into many activities they would otherwise ignore. Indeed, they will throw themselves into the activity according to how much they like or respect the teacher. It is at this point that the "buddy" teacher can elicit behavior from students that teachers using the type-1 strategy cannot.

The problems with this style of teaching in the school are numerous. First, this style is idiosyncratic, and may offend the remainder of the teaching staff for several reasons: other teachers may object to a fellow teacher tolerating or encouraging students to address him by such sobriquets as, "The Nose," "Double Ugly," and other endearing terms; they will also object to students roaming at will over the grounds even with a teacher's permission. A second problem is that the line between becoming a "clown" and a "friendly resource person" (a role most students would regard as different from that of teacher) is often a rather elusive one and somewhat dangerous. That is, it is difficult to justify the role "clown" anywhere in the school. Such a role may adversely affect the students by serving as a poor model (modeling is one of the most important learning methods here) and by removing controls. The latter raises the problem of control or "discipline" and may adversely affect the relationship between the school and pupil and community. Those teachers who have a natural ability to assume this role, that of "pals" with students while retaining the power to influence them toward meaningful goals, should be as effective as any other type with at least a portion of their students.

A third problem with this style of teaching is building expectations

about teachers that students may impose on successive teachers. It is true, of course, that any style of teaching may involve this problem.

Type-3 Strategy: A third orientation to teaching is that of the "class manager." In this style of teaching, the class is seen as a complex interrelationship of individuals with some common goals and some individual needs. It is the main job of the type-3 teacher to give rise to a system where students are most personally satisfied, and each student moves best toward individual goals. To achieve this, of course, is a good trick.

This style of teaching is achieved by tying together as closely as possible (1) behavior and (2) some kind of reward or "pay-off." This differs from the type-2 teaching style only in that the type-2 teacher pays off on the basis of individual contract, and the type-3 teacher pays off because the pupil achieves according to a prearranged or preagreed upon system. In setting up a system, the students are involved in the process as much as possible. Further, when students are dissatisfied with the system or specific contingencies, they are included in the alteration of the system.

The process of selecting meaningful rewards, as most teachers know, is not the simplest of judgments. In the first place, the values of rewards shift. One week, sodas (Cokes) are of high value; the next week, the students might refuse to take them. Further, students will not always indicate the actual reward value of such things. At least in initial relationship with teachers, pupils often indicate "no need" --for some the promise of a reward for good work is unnecessary, while others even state or imply that they would refuse such a reward if made available. However, the facts seem to be that students will take the rewards, and that the rewards are meaningful in influencing the academic performance of students. These are matters of less importance, however, than the apparent value of the relationship between student and teacher; one of the highest rewards available to some students is the approval of the teacher. The reward value of a teacher can be enhanced by the teacher giving extrinsic rewards, but it is not that simple--I give rewards; they will like me and do what I say. For one thing, it seems that many teachers (and adults in general) have made promises to these students that have not been kept, or have been misunderstood. It also seems to be part of the students' culture that a good person does something, not for its pay-off, but out of obligation, or respect for another person. These and other factors contribute to the general notion held by some students that achievement rewards are "bribes" and are not only somewhat tainted, but also, because of past history with "unreliable" adults, extremely uncertain. With these considerations in mind, it is little wonder that students are unexcited by a teacher who promises "something good" to a class if they will perform well. Still, the teacher, who makes a contract with a class and pays off, makes it clear to the class that the teacher is talking business. The

reward may not be valued by students, but the fact that the teacher means what she says is of value. Now, when the teacher sets up a system of performance and reward, the students listen. Further, if the students actually perform and are paid off for that performance, an interesting thing takes place: the meeting of the criterion for reward becomes rewarding. For example, if cookies are the reward (this actually happened early in our research; other more powerful reward agents have been discovered, and, hopefully, will be discovered) a student may work for the reward, boast of having achieved it, and give the cookies to a class member who had never received such a reward. Thus, being recognized is important and is a motivater.

As the system begins to "jell," and students respond to it as a system, the relationship between teacher and pupil becomes flexible. It is as if the students begin to relate to the system in some positive way and then need to find another way of relating to the teacher. At this point, the teacher can move the relationship as she chooses, from paternal assistance and coddling to a detached management style where students become increasingly involved in the class as a group with the teacher being used as a resource person for course content and social control.

The "management" oriented teacher does not necessarily miss out on close contact with students unless she chooses. In fact, those teachers who employ this style of teaching claim that they actually get closer to more students than when they use other methods. Also, they claim they see their students in a different, more exciting range of activities. This system can place on students varying degrees of responsibilities for class management, and it is in these areas that some teachers find reinforcing indications of student development. Further, it is not necessarily the case that course content suffers when matters of non-academic relevance are discussed. Indeed, heightened interest in class management problems is a good way--at times seemingly the only way--of stimulating interest in course content.

The problems and assets of this style of teaching are more difficult to specify and consider because the system is more complicated than either of the other two styles discussed

In the first place, there is the problem of the great effort it takes to get the system off the ground and then maintain it. This can be alleviated somewhat by involving the students in many aspects of program management, though it would appear that most individuals require some form of assistance in managing the classroom, or be a truly dedicated person and by implication, overworked. Second, the most successful system seems to depend on defining meaningful rewards and privileges, and distributing them to students according to some plan. This is often difficult because of financial constraints within the school system and restraints by administrative personnel who cannot, in the best interests of the entire educational structure, permit certain privileges to be extended to students. Third, if the system is at all successful, the students

become a "group"; that is, they recognize their power as a unit and begin to make demands on the teacher, administration, and/or institution. The teacher must be aware of this before type-3 teaching is adopted, or he will find it necessary to backtrack on promises made to demands (and often justifiable demands) from a student group. Fourth, the teacher must be able to accept short-term "setbacks" for the good of the long-range success of the system and students. For example, if students fail to meet the criterion for a reward, yet demand the reward, the teacher must take the unpopular position that further effort is required to achieve the reward. This may be met with threats of sit-down strikes, walk-outs, etc. This is a point when teacher must travel alone, and it may become a lonely road.

The potential benefits of this system seem to be deep involvement of students in classwork, assumption of responsibility by students for their behavior in and out of the classroom, assumption of some responsibility for students other than themselves, and the readiness to at least listen to a discussion of a task that might appear on the surface distasteful. It could be pointed out that the problem of "discipline" in this system is the same as it is in the regular system; control of misbehavior can be built into the system so that students realize the adverse consequences of misbehavior and wish to be involved in the problem of social control, just as they wish to be involved in any other meaningful aspect of school.

This style of teaching takes the teacher out of the role of being solely responsible for what happens in the classroom. It puts the teacher in the position of assisting students in questions of judgment. A survey of even the most difficult students revealed that they knew, all too clearly, what was "desirable" and what was "undesirable" behavior. The big question is how does one develop a system where students want to behave in a way that is most advantageous to them as individuals, to the peer group to which they belong, to the school, and to the community to which they aspire to become full-fledged members.

Students and Parents View the School

The following is an attempt to place together from diverse sources the perception of the school and the teachers from the point of view of the students and their parents. We do not pretend it represents a completely accurate picture as our analysis is not yet finished, but it does offer some valuable insights into the world of those whom school is to serve. Although it is based primarily on interviews of intermediate and high school students, these are generalizations also of interest to elementary teachers.

First of all, there should be no question that Hawaiian parents do value education, encourage their children to attend school, and consider a high school diploma an important goal.

Many of the children in the Nanakuli schools come from families in

which a high school education is a recently developed opportunity, and many of the students in our research samples are of the first generation to pursue or achieve graduation. Thus, the parents generally have had little experience with education, either directly or indirectly.

However, to the parents, a high school diploma is associated with a better job and a better life. Parents almost unanimously stress the importance of education. Even recent non-graduate (push-outs or drop-outs) parents of pre-school children discuss the significance of education, often using their own cases as negative examples. To many Hawaiian parents, a child completing high school represents a cherished wish; some reported that their parents have said, "The day you graduate will be the happiest day of my life."

Aside from stressing the importance of school the parents may also employ more tangible incentives. Some mentioned they had been promised substantial gifts for graduating, although the parents in these instances generally made little use of rewards. More often the incentives are negative; a poor report card will frequently provoke an angry confrontation between children and parents, who threaten privilege-denial and give a vigorous scolding. However, few students have experienced any long term and consistently imposed deprivation of privilege for school failure. The lost privileges are usually regained within a short period, and the parents give little further attention to either past or present performance --that is, until the next report card comes and the pattern repeats itself. From what students have told us, it appears the parents have little idea how to promote serious interest in and attention to school work. Indications from the youngsters and other sources make it relatively certain the problem is much more a problem of method than intent. Parents can lay stress on the importance of education as a generality, but they cannot explain specifically how effort expended in school or mastery of particular subjects is related to future benefits. Of course they do continually remind the children that jobs are contingent upon education, which is true, but apparently not the first job, which tends overwhelmingly to be unskilled in nature (see "Employment").

One area of confusion is homework. Most of the students we interviewed said they did not go to their parents for help with homework, but the parents say they do help their children (probably the younger ones), especially with math. The students also report that they do their homework, a point which their teachers generally say is untrue. Older brothers and sisters are sometimes consulted, according to the students, and a few report selecting high school subjects on the basis of the help they can get from siblings.

The majority of parents feel more comfortable when their children have homework (Cachola, personal communication, 1967), since they appear to identify this with (1) the quality of education provided by the school and (2) an assurance that their children are doing school work. However, despite their approval of the homework idea many seem to have little notion--at least from their children's point of view--of the amount

of effort and time necessary for success in high school, if their demands for assistance with the work at home are any indication. Some parents seem to feel that a child's real work begins when he comes home. They believe that sitting at a desk for six or seven hours must be a relatively pleasant, restful time, and a child so occupied should still have enough energy for housework.

It is difficult to generalize about the extent to which parents support the educational efforts of the school: some beat their children for ditching, others keep them home to do chores, etc. The majority seem to feel that the school has responsibility from 8 to 2 except for gross misbehavior, such as fighting or swearing at the teacher, which the parents expect the teachers to refer to the home.

Some students are in continual difficulty for cutting classes, breaking rules, fighting, and being disrespectful to teachers. Occasionally one will lose control and become exceedingly abusive, and some become so deliberately. As a result, discipline often supersedes teaching in priority, and an implicit truce may come to govern the situation. The teacher demands little, and the students provoke no trouble. Although there is a wide range of teacher effectiveness and attitude, nearly all teachers would agree that the Hawaiian population on the whole poses serious problems in the classroom, either for academic or behavioral reasons. While they are apt to be the first group identified as a special problem, other ethnic populations in the area also contribute to the difficulties in the schools. Simply being Hawaiian and being from Nanakuli are not regarded by students at least as prima-facie evidence of difficulty, or a matter of great personal concern. On the other hand, a good number felt that the whole school and the general area have a deserved reputation for being "tough," or in their terms "country," that is, students are unsophisticated and wild. Several comments indicated that the students thought some teachers might not like the schools in "country" areas, especially if their main concern was to teach their subject matter without consideration for the academic level of the students. However, the majority expressed a positive opinion of the school and the teachers they have had. Only a few expressed a desire to transfer either for academic reasons or because they felt the extracurricular activities somewhere else were more diverse and interesting.

Questions about favorite or disliked subjects and why they were liked or disliked seldom provoked discussion of course content; more often than not the response was centered on the teacher and the situation. Two exceptions to this--complaints that more typing courses and better sex education were needed--show some concern with the curriculum. Some students complained that their "electives" were actually assignments to the only available courses and not what they would have chosen. However, the vast majority of evaluations of courses used such categories as fun, interesting, easy, dull, boring, hard, or hard to understand, with favorite subjects chosen on the basis of best grades and favorite teacher. One interviewer felt this evaluation could

be further condensed to signify the course in which the student felt most competent, although there were a few who mentioned enjoying courses in which they had to struggle.

There are able and accomplished Hawaiian students at all grade levels in Nanakuli. The academically successful are a minority, by no means including all the intelligent ones. Many seem very bright despite having accomplished very little in school. The minority who do well are often overlooked in generalizations about Hawaiian adolescents which are expressed by school personnel. The majority of Hawaiian adolescents are in the low ability sections and take subjects with low requirements and standards. In 1966 approximately 70% of the 10th grade was below the 25th percentile on standardized tests of achievement, creating an enormous problem for teachers at the high school. The students consider low passing grades in courses graded to an elementary school level as satisfactory, although many feel that with more effort they could improve their performance. While this situation is a source of despair for many teachers, there is no evidence that the students feel the same.

Some feel a great loathing for teachers, often choosing truancy as a solution. For most there is an attempt to adjust to and be compliant with adult authority. When the pressure becomes too great (in the form of frustration and failure) and the meaningfulness too remote, then one goes to "sleep." However, even for those who have dropped out or are about to drop out, school still holds a strong appeal. Why? First of all, it is because that is where the "action" is. And second, despite repeated failure and unpleasant school experience, the idea of achieving a diploma and competence in school subjects retains some appeal.

What makes school an enjoyable experience, or an unpleasant one, is a complex of factors: the student, the composition of the class, the teacher, and subject matter. The students do not like to fail, to be "made an ass" (made to look foolish or awkward), or to enter a situation where there is a risk of exposing one's self by not having an answer, by not knowing how to do a task or problem, or by being singled out--except perhaps with great care and understatement--for work well done. At the same time, students do seem to like rewards and certainly strive for approval from pupils and teachers, and they attempt to enhance their prestige when it involves little risk of disapproval.

When students are unsure of a teacher, or a teacher is somewhat aloof, or has indicated that she will make public the results of a student's work, the students prefer to be told exactly what to do and prefer the kind of work which gives a clue regarding the nature of the results. For example, math drill; here there is a clue to finding if an answer is correct (by redoing problem, counting on fingers, use of certain printed tables, etc.). Further, the students would be happy if a coke were given at the end of the session for good work; actually, it would be more in local style if the coke were given during the lesson as a sort of obligating technique and recognition of the needs of the students. In this situation

be further condensed to signify the course in which the student felt most competent, although there were a few who mentioned enjoying courses in which they had to struggle.

There are able and accomplished Hawaiian students at all grade levels in Nanakuli. The academically successful are a minority, by no means including all the intelligent ones. Many seem very bright despite having accomplished very little in school. The minority who do well are often overlooked in generalizations about Hawaiian adolescents which are expressed by school personnel. The majority of Hawaiian adolescents are in the low ability sections and take subjects with low requirements and standards. In 1966 approximately 70% of the 10th grade was below the 25th percentile on standardized tests of achievement, creating an enormous problem for teachers at the high school. The students consider low passing grades in courses graded to an elementary school level as satisfactory, although many feel that with more effort they could improve their performance. While this situation is a source of despair for many teachers, there is no evidence that the students feel the same.

Some feel a great loathing for teachers, often choosing truancy as a solution. For most there is an attempt to adjust to and be compliant with adult authority. When the pressure becomes too great (in the form of frustration and failure) and the meaningfulness too remote then one goes to "sleep." However, even for those who have dropped out or are about to drop out, school still holds a strong appeal. Why? First of all, it is because that is where the "action" is. And second, despite repeated failure and unpleasant school experience, the idea of achieving a diploma and competence in school subjects retains some appeal.

What makes school an enjoyable experience, or an unpleasant one, is a complex of factors: the student, the composition of the class, the teacher, and subject matter. The students do not like to fail, to be "made an ass" (made to look foolish or awkward), or to enter a situation where there is a risk of exposing one's self by not having an answer, by not knowing how to do a task or problem, or by being singled out--except perhaps with great care and understatement--for work well done. At the same time, students do seem to like rewards and certainly strive for approval from pupils and teachers, and they attempt to enhance their prestige when it involves little risk of disapproval.

When students are unsure of a teacher, or a teacher is somewhat aloof, or has indicated that she will make public the results of a student's work, the students prefer to be told exactly what to do and prefer the kind of work which gives a clue regarding the nature of the results. For example, math drill; here there is a clue to finding if an answer is correct (by redoing problem, counting on fingers, use of certain printed tables, etc.). Further, the students would be happy if a coke were given at the end of the session for good work; actually, it would be more in local style if the coke were given during the lesson as a sort of obligating technique and recognition of the needs of the students. In this situation

the students prefer to place the responsibility of the class on the teacher, including the creative part of the lesson, since student responsibility to invent, create, or resolve (being in part, judgmental) opens them to criticism and ridicule.

Where there is a different type of relationship between teacher and pupil, or where the pupil does not feel jeopardized in his position with teacher or peers, students are more willing to participate. In fact, participation is the preferred response of secure adults in the community. Participation linked to the actual achievement of prestige is highly valued. This occurs when a teacher asks students to do something, and when the accomplishment of the task entitles the student to enjoy a privilege normally accorded an adult. For example, if a teacher were to ask a pupil to entertain 30 students for half an hour (this is a difficult task, because of the risk of being made an ass; at the same time, it is a highly desirable behavior since it accords to the pupil high prestige--that of teacher), and then took the pupil to the teacher's lounge for Cokes, the student would talk about the incident for a long time. The student would also remind the teacher on repeated occasions that he was prepared to do that again.

Thus, the liking or disliking of school activities and personnel involves a student's social anxieties, access to privileges, and willingness to take personal risk as well as the expectation of an immediate, concrete reward. Further, it is the balance of these factors that plays a significant role in student response to the school situation. When the teacher assumes the role of the authoritarian parent in school, it almost insures the acceptance on the part of the pupil of the role of the child. While it seems that many students begin about the 4th grade to alter this role and move toward independence and the adult role, while in class the students will revert to the subservient, passive, and compliant child because it is safer and offers no risk. Outside the school some students have already begun to assume a large share of the responsibility for their own actions, at least in terms of feeding themselves, finding shelter, and entertainment; these students are not easily reduced to a child's role in school while they attempt to establish their independence in school. Since the student will refuse to acknowledge the teacher is boss, conflict will result if the teacher must establish "who is boss" and if the teacher insists on it. This is not to say such students are invariably poorly adjusted in school; it is simply that they are invariably poorly adjusted to taking orders in matters they feel themselves capable of handling.

Pupils will respond to some situations with considerable spontaneity enthusiasm and creativity when there is no possibility they will be shamed for it. A hula class, for example, might find one of the girls taking over the class (it is much fun, and there is movement toward teacher-level prestige), although they will be watching the teacher closely for his reaction. If the teacher admits students know more than he does, the class will be a smashing success, and everyone (hopefully

including the teacher) will have good fun and learn something.

From the complaints of those interviewed two things appear to be very common in the Nanakuli schools. First, for some reason the students seem to remember and are able to describe their authoritarian teachers more readily than any other kind, although those who are singled out for special praise are somewhere between those who use type-2 and type-3 strategies successfully (i.e., those who are well organized "managers," but like an older sibling). And second, since they seem to focus on the authoritarian-type classroom, they appear to prefer that school work consist of serially presented facts and skills to be learned, one by one, by rote, and without anything left to discover or resolve about them. Assignments should be so specific that no doubt is possible over what constitutes a completed and correct piece of work. Their responses also suggest that many participate in a course only to the extent that it is perceived to be workable along these lines. Many of the Hawaiian children in our sample appear to see school as a series of unrelated tasks assigned daily, and one day's work independent of the next. The teacher is to plan and present only discrete tasks, and it is entirely up to her to plan so that the work will result in mastery of some subject matter. Their attitude, reflected in complaints, could be phrased: I am here; give me whatever it is you want today. Don't make it complicated and don't expect me to care about some long-range plan for learning or intellectual development. That part is up to the teacher, and I don't want to hear about it. For me school work is just an endless series of often pointless and often disconnected chores which I must complete in order to avoid reprimand and punishment and to achieve some education. Sometimes it happens to be fun or the teacher is fun, but usually it is very boring at best. It's not my concern to think about why I must do my assigned tasks or why they are important; all I know is I have to do them or I get into trouble.

While discussion and exchange of opinion is positively valued as an entertaining and interesting aspect of school, it is not generally perceived as a part of the serious learning process in authoritarian classes. For many, speaking up in class is unpleasant unless one is absolutely sure of being correct or that ridicule by others will not occur, so their opportunity to be responsive is quite limited. If the situation becomes one in which students are free to engage without the restraints of the authority-submission system that usually obtains between teachers and students, it becomes no longer a school activity as they see it, but a more or less pleasant social hour; however, this may not preclude their learning a lot.

Students answered the question, "What kind of students do teachers like to have in their classes?" by saying they want the kind who are "quiet, show respect, do the work assigned, and don't make trouble." Only a few said that the teachers want students to talk up in discussion, or that teachers want students to be responsive and friendly.

In summary, it appears that for most of our interviewees school is not a democratically operated system in which they can be involved, but rather a place where one is required to do things which are

decided by the adult in charge. No doubt this is not an accurate recounting of the situation in every classroom, but it is instructive to know that so many students perceive school to be so authoritarian.

Although it has not been deliberate, the schools have concealed from the community the extent to which their children are behind the children in other areas in Hawaii. At one point in our research we were surprised to find that people in Nanakuli were upset when we talked about the low levels of achievement that characterized the students. It became clear to us that the school, by passing students on who have not learned what is prescribed for a grade level, has led the parents to believe that things are not so bad. Of course there are many practical reasons why the school has been forced to advance children who have not learned. For one thing, there simply is not enough space to house large numbers of children who are held back. Besides, the school wisely realized that without drastic changes in the system, holding a youngster back would do no good. If by the 6th grade a child can read only a 2nd grade book, then another year of elementary school will do little to help him.

Regardless of explanations, when the parents of Nanakuli learn that the school has been willing to accept 2nd grade work from 14 year olds, they will be shocked. What will happen when the community becomes aware of the extent to which school has failed may be rather explosive.

Up until now with few exceptions parents have tended to agree with the idea that a child's failure in school is a family responsibility. As the school begins to speak of its failure to teach, the parents will become less willing to accept blame, and they will begin to ask many embarrassing questions, e.g., the ones raised above: Why do you pass children who have not learned the prescribed material? How can you blame "ordinary" citizens for the failure of the school to teach reading, for example? If the school cannot do it, who can? Why is it that a child can get a high school diploma and be barely able to read? Why is it that so many Hawaiian children are in the bottom sections? Thus, as the schools become more open about their limitations, parents will be asking the same questions which concern the educators, and a need for change will become increasingly evident.

References Cited

Cachola, Fredrico, Jr.
1967 Personal communication.